



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2006

No. 128

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 10:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### REPRESENTATIVE LEACH FOR PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I reflect on the gentleman from Iowa's almost four decades of public service, 30 of them as a distinguished Member of this House of Representatives. I am referring to my friend, JIM LEACH.

For many of the 12,000 men and women privileged to serve in the House of Representatives since the founding of the Republic, their careers are distinguished by service in this Chamber. JIM LEACH is one of those rare individuals for whom Congress itself is distinguished by his service. There is no one from whom I have learned more by his words, his deeds and his friendship. He is one of the few among us who, when he speaks on the floor of the House, people who care about substance listen. He consistently chooses the right words, and invites people to be part of the process. He listens. He is never drawn into petty partisan politics that too often rear their ugly heads.

For 30 years we have been privileged to watch his conscientious and

thoughtful work on the Financial Services and International Relations committees. JIM predicted the savings and loan crisis, and was spot on in his observations about American diplomacy from the Middle East to North Korea.

He was always dignified and principled, one of the few people who navigated the legislative halls successfully without being mired in partisan politics.

Indeed, in his congressional campaigns, he refused PAC contributions, didn't want out-of-State donations, he wouldn't run negative ads, and he rejected outside groups who tried to run negative ads on his behalf. He may have actually won his election by playing by the rules widely accepted as the norm and by which most prefer to operate. He may have won, but it wouldn't have been JIM LEACH and we all would have been the poorer.

While Iowa has lost JIM's service to Congress, America need not lose his service, his intellect and his unique talents. Ambassador John Bolton's appointment to the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations expires at the end of the year, and the United States cannot afford a gap in our representation. We desperately need a strong, positive direction to guide multilateral diplomacy in the United Nations.

There is not another American who is better suited to advancing United States interests in that important forum by temperament, experience or intellect than JIM LEACH. Remember, as a young foreign service officer, he actually served at the United Nations under then-ambassador George H.W. Bush before returning to Iowa as part of his family's business, and then on to 30 distinguished years of service in this body.

If anything, JIM may be better suited as a diplomat than at partisan politics. He is the most diplomatic politician I have ever met. Black and white was

not JIM's view of the world, especially if grays and even colors were part of the picture.

This week my colleague JIM WALSH and I will be circulating a "Dear Colleague" letter to Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, a letter that would urge President Bush to consider the appointment of JIM LEACH as our Permanent Representative to the United Nations. It is a nomination that no doubt would be greeted by acclaim. It would pass the United States Senate I predict unanimously, and we would all be the better off.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join us in signing this letter for the nomination of JIM LEACH.

### CONSERVATISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, voters did not reject the core values of traditional conservatism: Lower taxes, smaller government, traditional family values, and strong national defense. They did not reject that when they went to the polls on November 7. In the words of George Will, "Republicans were punished not for pursuing, but for forgetting conservatism."

This election represents neither a defeat for conservatism nor a victory for liberalism. The American people are a conservative people. While the election results put a majority in power in both the House and Senate for the first time in 12 years, we see that 36 percent of the American electoral describes itself as "conservative." That is double the number that consider themselves "liberal." We are a conservative nation.

A Rasmussen poll conducted after the election found that 61 percent of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8611

the American people think that higher taxes will hurt the economy. We are a conservative Nation, Madam Speaker. And I would tell you that what the voters said on Election Day is that they want conservative policies in place. Voters opted for the more conservative candidate and more conservative side of most issues. Nine States passed measures to restrict the government's ability to take land through eminent domain, taking private property for government use or public use.

Voters in Colorado, Idaho, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia and Wisconsin passed constitutional amendments to define marriage as between one man and one woman. Now a majority of States have enacted those constitutional protections stopping liberal judges from redefining marriage. We are a conservative Nation, Madam Speaker, and similar amendments on marriage have passed across the country in previous elections and will continue to happen going forward.

Previous Democratic wins in 1974 and 1986 swept into office new and very liberal freshman classes. If we look at the new Democrat freshman class of 2006, they are not liberals, Madam Speaker. What is striking is that this freshman class campaigned as conservatives. In fact, I know of one candidate who went out and advocated for certain principles. They might ring true to me as a Republican. He said he is pro-life, he is pro-gun. He is for traditional marriage, tax cuts, and for balancing the budget and a strong national defense. Sounds like a Republican to me, but he is a registered Democrat.

Pro-life Democrats were elected in North Carolina, Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania, just to name a few. Pro-gun Democrats were elected in Florida, Indiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Vermont. Wow, those are conservative principles, and I will tell you that it is a call to conservatives, to Republicans, to be true to those conservative issues we ran on originally.

After the Republicans' last electoral disaster, then-California Governor Ronald Reagan spoke before the Conservative Political Action Conference and said, "Our people look for a cause to believe in. Is it a third party we need, or is it a new and revitalized second party, raising a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors, which make it unmistakably clear where we stand on all of the issues troubling the people."

Madam Speaker, Ronald Reagan said that in 1975. These bold colors underpin our conservative platform, and that is what we must return to as a governing majority in the next election. As Republicans, that is what we should stand for.

Ronald Reagan went on to say, "We have just heard a call to arms based on that platform, and a call to us to really be successful to communicating and reveal to the American people the difference between this platform and the

platform of the opposing party, which is nothing but a revamp and a reissue and a running of a late, late show of the thing that we have been hearing from them for the last 40 years."

He said that 30 years ago. So I would submit to you today the Democrat platform is just what it has been for the last 70 years, but the new freshman class advocated a platform similar to what the Republicans have been advocating for the last 50 years.

Madam Speaker, I would tell you this election was a wake-up call for us to return to those bold colors and return to conservative values.

#### WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, the people have spoken. The election is over and they have said to us that they have given us their marching orders.

For 40 months American soldiers have been suffering, working, and dying for their country in the Iraq war. Since that day, 2,800 Americans have been killed. More than 20,000 have been wounded, most in gruesome fashion, and we have spent \$450 billion when Secretary Wolfowitz told us the Congress would pass only \$3 billion in appropriations to fund this curious exercise.

According to the National Intelligence Estimate, we have been made less safe. The other members of the axis of evil, Iran and North Korea, have developed or are developing nuclear weapons. We have forgotten our mission in Afghanistan where a democratically elected government is slowly losing control of the country.

The war in Iraq has produced more terrorists. According to the National Intelligence Estimate, it has found that the Iraq war has created more terrorists and terrorist sympathizers than have been destroyed. Iraq has become the central front in the war on terrorism, simply because this administration has made it so.

Vice President CHENEY said the insurgency was on its last throes, and more Americans die every month than did when the actual war itself was going on. Again, the National Intelligence Estimates said that fanatical terrorism has metastasized and spread across the globe.

At each and every turning point: The toppling of Saddam Hussein's statue; the dissolving the Iraqi Army; the creation of the Iraqi constitution; the vote for the constitution; the parliamentary elections; the capture of Saddam; or the death of Zarqawi, the Bush administration has told us victory is at hand.

Meanwhile, the bloodshed intensifies, hope dims, and more Americans come home with terrible wounds or in body bags.

Madam Speaker, this Nation has to have a plan and it is time that the President, whose war this is, come forward with such plan as to how we can win. Staying the course has failed. Americans will support what has to be done to get us out with honor and dignity and to win. Now the President can claim that he has the power to do these things, and clearly under the Constitution he does; but the President also has the duty to come forward with a plan that can be understood, accepted, carried out, implemented and successful for the American people.

If we are committed to staying in Iraq, the President must face the American people and adequately prepare them for the truth: The truth that his desires for Iraq will take more soldiers, more money, and cost more lives.

The American people respect and admire leadership and honesty. They admired it in Roosevelt, in Truman and in Ronald Reagan. Honesty begins with making an honest accounting of the costs and coming forward with a truthful statement of where we are and what we must do. If this Nation needs more equipment for our soldiers or needs more soldiers over there, then we must be told that and the President must face that, and we must do what has to be done to see to it that we have the proper forces there to prevail.

This war is being charged to our children and grandchildren. We need to examine whether or not it is just and proper for us to do that. We must pursue with vigor the diplomatic front. The countries in the area must be involved, and certainly little sign of that taking place is visible to all of us.

We have to swallow our pride. Let us talk to everyone, reengage the Syrians and the Iranians, in addition to those countries who are our allies in the region. And as we approach the fourth year of this war, and it must be observed that is longer than we were committed to the war in Europe in 1945, Syria and Iran have to be explored as possible participants in the solution to the problems which exist there.

The President must look the American people directly in the eye and he must deal honestly with our people. He must provide the generals with what they need and not shortchange our troops. We have only one option, and that is to either win or to get out.

Mr. President, your country asks you if Iran is so central to our security in the future, why haven't you made it possible to win and why have you not provided our military with the assets and the strategy that they need to win at the earliest time?

I was a soldier in World War II. Our purpose then was to win quickly, to win strongly, and to do so at the least cost to our people. Victory was our goal, and we were committed to it and we worked for it.

In this world the only thing that will count in this matter is success. In this war there has not been strong leadership from the White House to achieve